DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 364 860 CS 011 501

AUTHOR Rowe, Deborah Wells
TITLE Learning about Literacy and the World: Two-Year-Olds' and Teachers' Enactment of a Thematic Inquiry Curriculum.
PUB DATE Dec 93
NOTE 17p.; Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the National Reading Conference (43rd, Charleston, SC, December 1-4, 1993).
PUB TYPE Speeches/Conference Papers (150) -- Reports - Research/Technical (143)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC01 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS Beginning Reading; *Literacy; *Play; *Preschool Children; Preschool Education; Reader Response; Reading Aloud to Others; Reading Attitudes; Reading Research; *Teacher Behavior
IDENTIFIERS *Emergent Literacy

ABSTRACT

A study examined the ways teachers and children in a preschool classroom enacted informal book-reading and other informal book-related events. Four key patterns in children's activities and teachers' curricular responses were identified: (1) children naturally selected their own "themes" for reading at the book center, and often these themes were not the same as those selected by the teachers as the focus for the week's unit; (2) children approached the world with sophisticated learning strategies and an attitude of inquiry; (3) their personal inquiries often occurred over long periods of time; and (4) children viewed book-reading as connected to play in a variety of unanticipated ways. Continued data analysis suggests that global descriptions of curriculum in terms of general activities provide only part of the answer to how curriculum is enacted. Microanalyses of the entire set of videotaped events at the book center demonstrated that: the teachers held an implicit view of school book reading that excluded play whether or not it was related to books, and frequently defined or attempted to redefine all modes of responding to books as analytic discourse. Findings suggest that: scholars stop studying literacy, reading, and writing as if they were universal, culture-free behaviors; increased professional attention should be paid to the linking of "kid-watching" to "teacher-watching"; and teachers should become consciously aware of unenvisioned aspects of their teaching. (Fifteen references and a description of methods of data analysis are attached.) (RS)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED 364 860

LEARNING ABOUT LITERACY AND THE WORLD: TWO-YEAR-OLDS' AND TEACHERS' ENACTMENT OF A THEMATIC INQUIRY CURRICULUM

Deborah Wells Rowe
Peabody College, Vanderbilt University

PAPER PRESENTED AT THE 43RD ANNUAL MEETING OF
THE NATIONAL READING CONFERENCE
CHARLESTON, SC
DECEMBER 1993

Mailing Address: 1710 Old Hillsboro Rd., Franklin, TN 37064-4702
Home Phone: (615) 794-8941
Office Phone: (615) 322-8100

CS011501

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

X This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

D. Rowe

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC).

LEARNING ABOUT LITERACY AND THE WORLD: TWO-YEAR-OLDS' AND TEACHERS' ENACTMENT OF A THEMATIC INQUIRY CURRICULUM

With the recognition that literacy learning begins at birth (Holdaway, 1979; Teale, 1986), the study of very young children's interactions with print has increased dramatically. Home-based case studies of children under the age of 3 (e.g., Baghban, 1984; Bissex, 1980; Heath, 1983; Taylor, 1983, Taylor & Strickland, 1986; Yaden, Smolkin, & Conlon, 1989) have provided some initial insights into the kinds of hypotheses children construct as they begin to learn about reading and writing through everyday interactions with print in their homes. Despite the increasing number of very young children being cared for in group situations (Phillips & Howes, 1987, Children's Defense Fund, 1989), there has been relatively little attention to developing appropriate school-based literacy experiences for children under 3 years of age. This paper reports insights that have grown out of a year-long ethnographic study in which a university and school-based research team collaborated to plan and implement literacy experiences for 2-year-olds in a preschool classroom. Though the larger study involved the planning and implementing of both reading and writing experiences, this paper will focus only on the ways teachers and children in this classroom enacted informal book-reading and other informal book-related events (e.g., dramatic play). The goal of this paper is to explore two different perspectives on the enactment of this curriculum: the global perspective on curricular events held by the research team while working with children and planning curriculum during the course of the study, and the somewhat different perspective offered by looking at our experiences through the lens of sociolinguistic microanalyses of videotapes after the close of data collection.

The first section of the paper describes curricular insights developed collaboratively by the research team during the course of the study. In particular, I describe key ways that the *enacted curriculum* or actual experiences of teachers and children changed as a result of our commitment to *kidwatching* . As a teaching team, we were committed to observing children's responses to the curriculum, and to "following the children's lead." As a result we altered our decisions about time, space, materials, and interactions in a number of ways.

The second section of the paper grows out of an opportunity to reflect on the enactment of the literacy curriculum in a way not possible during the course of the study. Sociolinguistic microanalyses of book-reading events have made more apparent the

unenvisioned curriculum -- those aspects of the literacy curriculum for which we had no conscious plans because we were operating in implicit and habitual ways (Erickson, 1986). Because I was a teacher/researcher in this study, and centrally involved in both planning and implementing literacy experiences for the children, I was the adult reader in many of the informal book-reading events videotaped at the book center. For the purposes of this paper, I have chosen to illustrate the powerful influence of the unenvisioned curriculum by discussing several surprising insights about my own teaching. Through sociolinguistic microanalyses of these data, this paper analyzes book-reading as an event in which participants construct a cultural ideology -- a system for assigning meaning and significance to what is said and done and for socially defining participants (Bloome, 1993). In particular, I focus on unexamined ways in which I implicitly defined school literacy as I read books with children, and the potential impact of these interactions on the children's definition of themselves as readers and thinkers, as well as on their construction of sociocognitive strategies for interpreting books. Details of the methods used in this study are provided in Appendix A.

Initial Envisionments for the Literacy Curriculum

The aim of the study reported here was to adapt research-based notions about preschool literacy instruction to a group of very young children: two-year-olds. To this end I, my research assistant, the director of the childcare center, and the classroom teachers collaborated to increase the integration of reading and writing experiences into the theme-based units already underway in this preschool classroom. Initially, we did not intend to challenge our usual approach to thematic curriculum. Additionally, though we had explicitly talked about sophistication of 2-year-olds as learners, we did not articulate ours an "inquiry" curriculum. Instead, our goals were more global. We agreed to work together to develop functional, learner-centered reading and writing experiences, and to track the children's responses to the resulting curriculum.

Reviews of the field notes I recorded after early meetings with the school staff reveal that our initial planning centered around discussion of key beliefs about children and curriculum, as well as my presentation of global proposals for ways the ongoing curriculum could incorporate books and writing more extensively. Our initial envisionments for what this might entail included introducing both a writing center and a library center to the classroom. To make my proposals more concrete, I described literacy activities at the book and writing centers in other preschool classroom where I had worked (Rowe, 1994). We decided to place sets of books (text sets) related to the teachers' unit themes in the book center, and as often as possible to have an adult available to read to the

children. Thematic instruction as initially envisioned in this study and recommended by many early childhood educators, involved the teachers in selecting a weekly theme, and then planning related activities for learning center and group time experiences. For example, when studying nursery rhymes, the teachers brought in mittens for "The Three Little Kittens" to wash in the sink of the dramatic play area. In addition to the text sets, art activities and the books selected for reading at group time were the most frequent links to the theme.

Negotiating the Curriculum with the Children: New Decisions about Time, Space, Materials, and Interactions

As a result of observation of and collaboration with the children, the envisioned curriculum changed significantly over the course of the year Though each of us began the study with a commitment to learner-centered instruction ("following the children's lead") and kidwatching as a means of informing the curriculum, we found that the children challenged us in unanticipated ways to give up or alter familiar ways of organizing time, space, materials, and interactions. Even our definitions of reading and writing were challenged. Though a full description of the children's responses to books is beyond the scope of this paper, a brief description of four key patterns in children's activities at the book center and our curricular responses is provided as a basis for illustrating the extent to which the children and teachers negotiated the initial envisionments for the curriculum in the course of enacting it.

First, we observed that children in this classroom naturally selected their own "themes" for reading at the books center, and that often these themes were not the same as those selected by the teachers as the focus for the week's unit. This observation challenged our initial notion of a unitary curricular focus on teacher-selected weekly themes. In order to support the children's interests and requests for books and materials, we quickly found ourselves gathering materials related to children's themes as well as to those selected by the teachers. Instead of featuring one text set each week related to the teachers' theme, we began to display text sets related to as many of the individual children's interests as possible. To increase our awareness of all the children's personal themes, we began to specifically track children's selection of books and their in-class interests. Additionally, we asked parents to help us become aware of their child's special interests by responding to a questionnaire and through informal conversations as they delivered and picked up their children. With this increased awareness of individual children's themes, teachers were able to make suggestions for books and activities that highlighted connections to the children's personal inquiries. Though the classroom teachers continued to use their planned themes

for some aspects of curricular planning, in informal experiences at the learning centers, we attempted to support children's interests by providing opportunities for exploration of multiple themes.

Second, we made the general observation that the 2-year-olds with whom we were working approached the world with sophisticated learning strategies and an attitude of inquiry. Children's personal inquiries often started with open-ended exploration of a topic or of a particular book, and continued with repeated rereadings, asking questions, and making connections to life experiences, other books, and to play. Though each of us began the study with a strong respect for children as learners, we were amazed by the complexity of the children's questions and the intensity of their explorations into topics of personal interest.

These observations led to several curricular decisions that altered the experiences of both teachers and chidden. First, though the norms of this child-centered classroom had required us to support children's selections of activities, kidwatching helped us to value their choices and their repetition of activities because of the impact their developing expertise on the sophistication of their responses. This led the teachers to alter their interaction patterns at the book center by consciously searching for and highlighting connections between the children's themes and in-class experiences. We also began to demonstrate "learning to learn" strategies as we helped the children find answers to their questions. For example, we demonstrated how to use books as references for unanswered questions, and how to search out sections of text that demonstrated connections mentioned by the children.

A third observation of the children's responses was that their personal inquires often occurred over long periods of time. It was not unusual for a 2-year-old in the this study to be intensely interested in reading about, talking about, and playing out themes related to dinosaurs or *The Wizard of Oz* for a period weeks over even months. Though children varied in the intensity of their focus on a single theme, as a rule, the children explored their interests for periods much longer than the one week units initially planned by the teachers. As children continued to pursue their interests, they negotiated with us certain kinds of changes in our display of books. In particular, their requests for favorite books required us to rethink our strategy of storing away books from previous themes. Instead, we realized that children needed access to a predictable library of books that was continuously available. We determined that our initial decisions about book selection, storage, and display worked against children's desire to revisit and build depth knowledge of books related to their personal interests.

Finally, we observed that children viewed book-reading as connected to play in a variety of unanticipated ways. These connections included bringing book-related props and toys to the center as well as engaging in dramatic play in the center. This observation will be discussed in more detail in the second section of this paper, but in general we came to explicitly recognize that our initial plans for activities and materials at the book center were adult-centered and did not match children's ways of responding to books or of using literature in their lives. We found that play was a central means of experiencing and responding to books for these young children both during informal reading events and in other activities at school. This observation led us to make several important changes in space, materials, and interactions at the book center. We began to consciously support play as a mode of response by storing toys and props related to the books in the center. As we read with children, we began to suggest links between books and toys or dramatic play themes. We also sometimes engaged in book-related dramatic play with the children who were present at the center. A final curricular decision was to decentralize the storage and display of books. Where before books had primarily stored and read in the book center, we now began to display books in other areas of the classroom such as the art or block center.

Conclusions about the Effects of Kidwatching on the Enacted Curriculum

The preceding discussion illustrates the socially constructed nature of child-centered literacy instruction and curriculum planning. Teachers made changes to the curriculum in response to their observations of children's book-related experiences. These involved changes in existing ways of selecting books, displaying materials, structuring time, and organizing space. It is important to note that because of the nature of the research project underway, both university- and classroom-based teachers had a special commitment to observing and supporting children's explorations of books. Additionally, we were aided in developing this kind of child-centered literacy curriculum by access to videotape recordings of each day's activities.

Overall, I want to concur with the many authors who have proposed kidwatching (e.g., Harste, Woodward, & Burke, 1984) as a powerful source of professional insight and change both within our individual classroom and potentially for others who read about our study. Though this classroom is atypical because of the intensity of the research observations described above, it shares many features with other child-centered programs (cf. Bredekamp, 1986) including a commitment to informal observation of children as a means of informing the curriculum. The value of detailed description of the curricula implemented in research classrooms such as this is not that outcomes are universally generalizable, but instead that by becoming explicitly aware of patterns in children's

responses and curricular issues raised in this and other studies, teachers' lenses for observation and for curriculum planning are altered. As the research team found in this study, until we became explicitly aware of the nature of children's responses to books, we could not make purposeful curricular decisions to support that learning.

The Unenvisioned Curriculum: The Role of Unexamined Participation Patterns in the Enacted Curriculum

I want to turn now to a discussion of the *unenvisioned curriculum* in this classroom -- that part of the enacted curriculum that remained outside of our conscious awareness, but which nevertheless served as an important part of the environment in which children learned about literacy. Continuing analyses of these data after the close of data collection suggest that global descriptions of curriculum in terms of general activities of teachers and children, distribution and selection of materials, and the organization of space and time, provide only part of the answer to how curriculum is enacted, and how teachers teach and children learn about literacy in a particular setting. Sociolinguistic microanalyses of the participation patterns used to enact informal book reading events in this classroom, bring to light the important impact of teacher and child interaction styles on what is eventually learned. (See Appendix A for details of the microanalyes conducted in the this study.) Green and her colleagues in the Santa Barbara Discourse Group (1992) point out that "what teacher and student means, who may assume, the roles, and how the roles will be enacted are not givens, but situationally defined in the roles and relationships that are possible among members" (p. 30). My application of this notion to the present study suggests that we cannot assume as givens what it means to be an adult or child participant in a book-reading event, or what kind of learning is likely to take place. Instead, book-reading is a dynamic event, with participation structures and learning outcomes deeply rooted in the culture of this classroom. It is through daily microencounters with teachers and peers that children are defined by others and come to define themselves as certain kinds of readers and learners. In this study, by reading and talking with teachers in the book center, children learned what constituted school literacy, and adopted ways of interacting with teachers and peers in book-related events. Teachers supported children when their comments and actions connected with their implicit views of school literacy, and rejected children's attempts to define literate behaviors in other ways. Children, too, exerted powerful influence on definitions of literacy in this classroom. This is clearly illustrated by their incorporation of play within the bounds of reading events.

In the remainder of this paper, I will highlight the extent to which aspects of the enacted curriculum are influenced by teachers' unexamined, implicit beliefs about school

literacy and about children as readers and learners. To illustrate this, I want to return to the research team's decision to incorporate play activities at the book center. I have selected this example because it is this set of curricular decisions that I would identify as the greatest triumph for kidwatching and as the clearest instance of teacher-child collaboration in the development of our enacted curriculum.

At the beginning of the study, I envisioned the book center as a comfortable place to read books. I did not initially include play or play props in my planning. Nevertheless, from the beginning of the study children made several kinds of connections between book reading and play. These included: holding toys related to books as we read, engaging in dramatic play related to the book during reading events, and using book information, themes, or language in dramatic play occurring elsewhere in the classroom. Let me illustrate with some examples from early in the study before our teaching team consciously recognized the importance of book-play connections.

Example 1: January 23 (VT)[1]

I am reading *Monster Road Builders* by Angela Royston and Graham Thompson to several children at the book center. Christopher is sitting on a bulldozer riding toy as we read. He holds the receiver of a toy phone, and puts it to his ear. Though his first words are partially unintelligible on the videotape, it is clear he has moved into the world of dramatic play.

(1) Christopher to imaginary character on other end of the phone. : "Hey (***)."

(2) Christopher to participants in the book center: "I'm calling one of the workmen."

(3) Debbie: "You're calling one of the workmen?"

(4) Christopher into the phone: "Hello?"

(5) Debbie returns her attention to the book and begins reading aloud.

(6) Richard picks up a stuffed dog from the shelf: "Ruff, ruff."

(7) Debbie: "There's your doggie."

(8) Christopher: "Let me see your little dog. [pats it] I'm petting him."

(9) Debbie: "He's very soft isn't he?"

(10) Debbie to Christopher and Richard: "Anyone know what this one is?" [points to picture of scraper in the book."

---

[1]The source of this transcription and description is videotape.

This event is typical of many that occurred in the book center when a child introduced dramatic play related to the book being read. My response to Christopher at (3) recognizes

the play but does not sanction it by extending the topic with comments or questions. Richard's introduction of the doggy play at (6) is related to Christopher's play at the level of genre (dramatic play with toys) rather than topic. Christopher recognizes and sanctions this connection by taking a role in Richard's dramatic play script. I, on the other hand, acknowledge their play at (9) with a statement, but deny the appropriateness of the play at (10) by asking a question designed to repropose book-related talk as the genre of events at the book center.

On another day, Christopher and Alex persist in playing with a tape measure as we once again read *Monster Road Builders*, a perennial favorite. Most of this play is silent, though from time to time I have to stop reading or talking about the book to mediate disputes about access to the tape measure. Sometimes the boys talk among themselves as I read. At the start of the event I attempt to link the tape measure to the topic of "builders" introduced in the books.

Example 2: January 25 (VT)

(1) Debbie to Christopher who is holding the tape measure: "Sometimes builders have to have tape measures, but I don't think they usually . . ."

(2) Alex interrupts to tell about his toy dump truck.

As the event continues, the boys have a disagreement about who should hold the tape measure, so I turn my attention to it, too.

(3) Alex holds tape measure and begins to pull its end out: "There are numbers on it."

(4) Debbie: "Yeah, there are numbers on it. Let's see. What should we measure? You want to measure this book?"

The event continues as the children and I measure the length and width of the book. Soon another teacher arrives with a new book, and proposes that we read it. Through reading and talking about 3 more books, the boys continue to take turns playing with the tape measure. At least twice more we stop to measure books, or illustrations in books. At the end of the event, I suggest to Christopher that he get a clipboard and pencil to write down the size of the things we have measured. I support this suggestion by going to the writing center to help him locate supplies.

In this event, the children's choice to play with objects is at odds with my view of book reading events. However, given classroom norms about following the children's selection of activities, I do not ask them to move this play elsewhere. Instead, as in Example 1, I attempt to reengage them in book-talk. When this is not successful, book-

reading is temporarily stopped in favor of the play. However, it is no accident that I choose books or illustrations in books as objects to be measured. In doing so, I implicitly link the children's play to books, though the connection is with books as physical rather than literary objects. Still, it is clearly an attempt to redefine their play as a literacy event. When this is largely unsuccessful, I attempt to do so by suggesting that the boys *write* about what they have measured.

Microanalyses of the entire set of videotaped events at the book center demonstrated that I initially held an implicit view of school book reading that excluded play whether or not it was related to books, and that required that all talk be topical related in recognizable ways to the book being read. Additionally, in these conversations I demonstrated and frequently encouraged children to engage in analytic talk about books. That is, I encouraged them to compare and contrast specific aspects of the text and illustrations and to give evidence of connections to life experiences and to other books. As the study progressed, I eventually became aware of the frame clash between the children's and my expectations about the relations between play and book reading. As a teacher this awareness was preceded by an unarticulated sense of discomfort with my responses to children's choice to bring toys to the book center. Eventually, I became conscious of this frame clash as I reviewed video tapes of the day's events. I noticed myself physically pushing the toys outside of the boundaries of the book center as soon as children abandoned or lost interest in them. After discussing this with the rest of the teaching/research team, we made the decision to support the play-literacy connection in the book center by assembling *book and toy sets*, where before we had thought only in terms of book sets.

What I found most interesting when I began to microanalyze the book reading events occurring after this curricular decision was the way that I incorporated toys and play into the book center. Example 3 illustrates typical ways that play became integrated into book reading events when I was the adult reader.

Example 3: February 1 (VT)

Christopher brings a dinosaur puppet over to he book center where I am setting things up for the morning.

Christopher: "I think this is a duckbill!"

Debbie: "It does look like a duck bill. We should check it out and see . . . Here I think this is the one [book] that tells about duckbills."

Debbie selects *Giant Dinosaurs* by Erna Rowe from the shelf and pages through it.

Debbie: "Which one [book] did we read about duck bills?"

She reaches for *A Visit to the Dinosaurs* by Aliki.

Christopher selects *Giant Dinosaurs* to read together. Debbie locates and reads the section on duckbills.

Debbie: "Look! It says, 'their bills were shaped like ducks, so they were called duckbill'."

Debbie touches the bill of the puppet: "I do think it looks like a duckbill."

In this event and in many others after the incorporation of toys and props into the book center, I demonstrated the use of books as references or resources for learning about toys or the real world objects they represented. What is particularly interesting here, is that I have redefined play at the book center as requiring analytic book talk of the same kind I previously encouraged children to use as they talked about book to life and book to book connections. Though at the time, I saw myself as following the children's lead, closer analyses of these events demonstrates that I have sanctioned only some aspects of the children's play, and for the most part have redefined it in ways that are very much in line with my existing notions about book-reading events. Though children did not initially make the kind of analytic book to play connection I demonstrated and sanctioned, by the end of the school year they initiated this kind of connection quite often.

My point in highlighting the participation structures in these book reading events, is that they have a pervasive, if unrecognized, impact on children's definitions of literacy events, their definition of themselves as readers and players, and the strategies they learn for responding to and interpreting books. In essence these taken-for-granted ways of acting demonstrate the cultural ideology of the classroom. As Green and her colleagues suggest (Santa Barbara Discourse Group, 1992a), children are learning what is possible, where, with whom, for what purposes, and with what consequences. Though none of us, including myself ever verbalized or would have been able to verbalize it at the time, these children learned, in part, that books are the topic to which all activities at the book center must be related when one reads with a teacher. Both book-related talk and play are permissible, but analysis of the relationship of these experiences and props to books is a preferred mode of discourse. Children also learned a variety of things about books and the nature of text, including the value of both picture and text for providing information, the need to interpret books in relation to one's life experiences, and that books serve as resources for understanding the world. Finally, children were defined and came to define themselves as readers who could use books to learn about topics of interest.

After analyzing the larger data set for the kinds of intertextual connections made by children and teacher and attempting to identify the social and cognitive outcomes of these

connections, I admit that I continue to value the kinds of school book experiences that took place in this classroom. However, I am now explicitly aware that these children experienced a particular kinds of *literacy* and *inquiry* that were rooted in the subculture of this classroom, and that understandings about literacy were co-constructed in hundreds of face-to-face events.

In some ways, children's options to experience literacy were limited when they read books with me. Without recognizing it, I frequently defined or attempted to redefine all modes of responding to books as analytic discourse. Since this was not a conscious decision, I and the children had no other options, and I'm not sure at all that I'd do things exactly the same way now that I'm aware of some of my own implicit views of school literacy. In fact, my habitual ways of reading with children do not exactly match my examined beliefs. For example, at a theoretical level I believe that analysis is only one of many important kinds of response to text. The lived-through experience children create for themselves as they link books to dramatic play is something I value as well. Though children continued to experience this type of dramatic play when they were with peers, I now see many of my interactions at the book center and in other centers as discouraging rather than supporting this experience. At the close of this strand of microanalysis, I am highly aware of the powerful role of the implicit views of school literacy conveyed by teacher demonstrations and talk for setting the boundaries for literate behavior even in student-centered classrooms.

Becoming Aware of the Unenvisioned Curriculum: Conclusions and Implications for Research and Practice

These insights about the influence of the unenvisioned aspects of the enacted curriculum have a number of implications for the conduct of research, teacher education, and teaching. First, addressing the research community, I would suggest that we need to stop studying "literacy," "reading," and "writing" and so on, as if they were universal, culture-free behaviors. As this research and other sociolinguistic studies of classroom interaction (e.g., Bloome, 1993; Santa Barbara Discourse Group, 1992a, 1992b; Gumperz, 1986; Michaels, 1986) demonstrate, literate behaviors are culturally rooted. For example, researchers need to examine what they mean by "book reading" and empirically investigate how participants in their studies define it. Though I would like to say that we could glean this information from microanalysis of small samples of behavior, I do not think this is the case. In my experience, and that of others (Santa Barbara Discourse Group, 1992a), in order to understand the meaning of events from the perspective of the participants, one must share as much of their history of interactions as possible. This suggests that we need to continue to pursue opportunities for long-term ethnographic work

in home and school settings. I expect this line of research may have promise for uncovering some of the etiology for school failure of non-mainstream students. For some time, researchers (e.g., Heath, 1983) have suggested that when children come from homes where definitions and enactments of literate behavior vary widely from school literacy, children have difficulty participating successfully. An awareness of the possible kinds of match and mismatch could potentially help teachers begin to make professional decisions about the interface between home and school.

For teacher educators and teachers, I think studies such as this serve as a call for increased professional attention to the linking *kidwatching* to *teacher-watching*. Our field has gained enormously by watching children, and from those observations developing descriptions of hypotheses, beliefs, and intentions implicit in their actions. This study suggests that it is time that we begin to make parallel observations of teachers at work, so that a variety of definitions of school literacy, and expectations for participation in literacy events can be empirically described. With this information, teachers can begin to reflexively interrogate their own practice in order to identify the nature of the participation patterns they use in their classrooms, and further to consider the social and cognitive consequences of those interaction patterns. As teacher-educators we need to develop appropriate and workable means for helping teachers conduct such reflexive examinations of their own talk and actions. Through teaching-watching, those interested in curricular change may potentially find some of the answers to questions of why curricular innovations often fail, and to why teachers have such a difficult time changing more than surface features of their instruction. I expect that it is often a mismatch between beliefs implicit in a teacher's interactions and those explicit in their lesson planning that causes lessons to fail and innovations to be abandoned. Empirical looks at the match between participant structures, the planned purposes of lessons, and the broader goals of literacy curricula seem to be an important direction for future research.

Overall, I would suggest that bringing unenvisioned aspects of teaching to the conscious awareness of teachers could add a new dimension to their professional lives. Certainly, my experiences in this study have caused me to examine my own practice in new ways, and have provided a new basis for making decisions about literacy curricula. If in the next decade teacher-watching of the sort illustrated by this study becomes a focus for researchers and teacher educators I believe we have an increased possibility to construct classroom literacy experiences that are more inclusive and more supportive of children's learning.

References

Baghban, M. (1984). *Our daughter learned to read and write. A case study from birth to three.* Newark, DE: International Reading Association.

Bissex, G. (1980). *GYNZ AT WRK. A child learns to write and read.* Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

Bloome, D. (1993). The social construction of intertextuality in classroom reading and writing lessons. *Reading Research Quarterly,* **28**, 304-333.

Bredekamp, S.(Ed.) (1986). *Developmentally appropriate practice.* Washington, DC.: National Association for the Education of Young Children.

Children's Defense Fund. (1989). *A vision for America's future* Washington, DC.: National Association for the Education of Young Children.

Erickson, F. (1986). Tasks in times: Objects of study in a natural history of teaching. In K. Zumwalt (Ed.), *Improving teaching. ASCD Yearbook* (pp. 131-147). Alexandria, VA: Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development.

Harste, J. , Woodward, V., & Burke, C. (1984). *Language stories and literacy lessons.* Portsmouth, NH: Heinemann.

Heath, S. (1983). *Ways with words.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Holdaway, D. (1979). *The foundations of literacy.* Sydney: Ashton Scholastic.

Phillips, D., & Howes, C. (1987). Indicators of quality in child care: Review of research. In D. Phillips (Ed.), *Quality in child care: What does research tell us?* (pp. 1-20). Washington, DC.: National Association for the Education of Young Children.

Rowe, D. (1984).*Preschoolers as authors. Literacy learning in the social world of the classroom.* Cresskill, NJ: Hampton Press.

Taylor, D. (1983). *Family literacy.* Exeter, NH: Heinemann.

Taylor, D., & Strickland, D. (1986). *Family storybook reading.* Portsmouth, NH: Heinemann.

Teale, W. (1986). The beginnings of reading and writing Written language development during the preschool and kindergarten years. In M. Sampson (Ed.), *The pursuit of literacy* (pp. 1-29). Dubuque, IA: Kendall/Hunt.

Yaden, D., Smolkin, L., & Conlon, A. (1989). Preschoolers' questions about pictures, print, convention, and story text during reading aloud at home. *Reading Research Quarterly,* **24**, 188-214.

APPENDIX A: METHODS

Overview of the Study

Data analyzed in this paper were collected as part of a 9 month ethnographic study of literacy learning in a preschool classroom serving 38 White, middle class, 2-year-olds. Goals for the larger study included implementing and describing children's responses to age-appropriate, research-based, reading and writing experiences. Children attended one or two days per week, with classroom enrollment ranging from 12 to 15 children each day. Ginger, the lead teacher, and Michelle, her assistant worked with the children each day throughout the week. I was present in the classroom in the role of teacher/researcher two days per week (Wednesday and Friday) from the beginning of the school day until the children's nap began after lunch. Because of enrollment patterns, I was able to observe most of the 16 children with whom I personally worked on both of their school days. (A few children attended only one day, or attended on an alternate pattern such as Monday and Wednesday.) My research assistant, Leigh Ann, served as a teacher/researcher on two additional days each week allowing us to follow a additional 20 children.

Data Collection techniques. Using ethnographic techniques of participant observation, video recording, and informal interviewing, my research assistant and I collected data in the classroom library center, where both story books and information books were arranged into text sets related by theme, language patterns, authors, etc. Children's responses to books were also recorded at the writing center, during large group experiences, and in other ecological areas such as blocks, dramatic play, and on the playground.

Data Analysis techniques. Data analysis was ongoing during all phases of data collection using the constant comparative method. The analyses reported here use as a data source teacher and researcher plans for the curriculum, methodological notes reflecting in-process changes and negotiation of the curriculum between the classroom teachers, the teacher/researchers, and the children, and field notes and video recordings of informal book-reading and other book-related events at the book center.

Sociolinguistic microanalyses of student and teacher participation patterns in book-reading events initially involved transcription of all events videotaped at the Book Center during the second semester of this study (January to May) on days when I was present at the preschool. Of the 13 days for which videotapes were available, 9 one-hour tapes recorded book reading events. Though all teachers are recorded in the data as readers at the Book Center, this paper focuses only on microanalyses of events where I was the adult

reader. Tapes were submitted to microsociolinguistic analyses aimed on identifying intertextual connections proposed by teachers and students, the responses of others to those connections, and the social and cognitive consequences of these activities. Procedures for these analyses were adapted from Bloome's (1993) techniques for analyzing the social construction of intertextuality in classroom events. First, videotapes were viewed repeatedly to identify and transcribe all instances where children or teachers made intertextual connections between the meanings presented in books and other linguistic or nonlinguistic texts (e.g., talk, gesture, art, writing, dramatic play). As in Bloome's system, transcripts were first divided into message units, then coded as to the genre/event type (e.g., book talk, personal stories, dramatic play), and the dimensions (e.g., propose, recognize, acknowledge) and levels (e.g., words/messages, genre), and social consequences (e.g., defining children as certain types of readers, defining the parameters of school literacy). In my analyses, I added a step of coding message units as to their cognitive consequences, with particular focus on the kinds of reading strategies students were learning (e.g., analyze book to life connections and give specific evidence for your conclusions). As a final step I looked across the coded transcripts to categorize the kinds of intertextual connections made by both children and teachers, and to identify the consequences these connections for students' literacy learning.